

Appendix B – Transaction Testing Results

Preordering

E&Y selected the following random samples from the systems/interfaces listed below to test the accuracy and completeness of the Preorder PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Loop Qual. System – 40 wholesale and 40 retail transactions
- Ordering and Billing Forum (“OBF”) Adapter Local Service Order Guide 5 (“LSOG”) – 260 wholesale transactions
- Ameritech Enterprise Messaging Service (“AEMS”) LSOG 1 – 260 wholesale transactions
- TCNet LSOG 1 – 40 wholesale transactions
- EDI/CORBA Transaction Tables LSOG 4 – 260 wholesale transactions
- Web Verigate LSOG 4 – 260 wholesale transactions
- Exchange Access Control & Tracking System (“EXACT”) – 60 wholesale transactions

Note: 1,220 unique preorder transactions were tested.

<u>PM Number</u>	Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM	<u>Properly Included¹</u>	<u>Properly Excluded²</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
1.1	80	77	3	0	0%	1
1.2	Note 1					
2	1,080	477	526	77	7%	41
IN 1	60	37	23	0	0%	1
MI 10	1,080	504	496	80	7%	17
MI 16	1,080	504	496	80	7%	7
Total	3,380			237	7%	

¹ As utilized throughout this document, the term “properly included” refers to the fact that the detailed transaction record selected from the source system prior to the application of any Business Rules was tested and determined to be appropriately included in the file utilized to prepare the monthly PM results based on the application of the Business Rules. Additionally, the transaction data (i.e., start times, end times, etc.) were accurately captured and transferred to the reporting systems, and interval calculations related to the transaction, if applicable, were accurately performed.

² As utilized throughout this document, the term “properly excluded” refers to the fact that the detailed transaction record selected from the source system prior to the application of any Business Rules was tested and determined to be appropriately excluded from the file utilized to prepare the monthly PM results based on the application of the Business Rules.

Note 1: Transaction testing was not performed for this PM due to issues identified in the other testing procedures that indicated this PM was not calculated correctly. Alternative procedures were employed to allow for exception reporting.

Exceptions: Our transaction testing revealed 80 exceptions to compliance with the Business Rules, 77 of which impacted PMs 2, MI 10, and MI 16. The remaining 3 exceptions impacted only PMs MI 10 and MI 16. Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report:

PM Impacted	Exception	Number of Exceptions
2, MI 10, MI 16	For EDI LSOG 1 transactions the Company excluded certain address verification transactions during the Evaluation Period that were not able to be matched to living units or street addresses. (Compliance Report, ³ Section I, Issue 1)	23
2, MI 10, MI 16	After the implementation of the LSOG 5 version of EDI ("LSOG 5") in April 2002, the Company improperly reported LSOG 5 transactions in which a request for a customer service record and directory listing is made as one combined request in the Verigate CSR submeasure. However, this combined level of submeasure is not listed in the Business Rules. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 2)	41
2, MI 10, MI 16	After the implementation of LSOG 5, the Company improperly counted certain LSOG 4 preorder queries in the CSR and TN submeasure results. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 3)	11
2, MI 10, MI 16	The Company excluded certain valid transactions during the Evaluation Period due to an error in the ICS/AEMS loading process, where an error in the program code caused certain valid transactions to be dropped. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 8)	2
	Subtotal	77
MI 10, MI 16	Certain valid EDI LSOG 1 transactions were improperly excluded from the reported results of MI 10 and MI 16 due to an error in the ICS/AEMS loading process, where an error in the program code caused certain valid transactions to be dropped. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 8)	3
	Subtotal MI 10, MI 16	80

³ "Compliance Report" with section and issue numbers refer to those reported in Attachment A of the Report on the Company's Compliance with the Illinois Performance Measurement Business Rules and Corrective Action Implemented that accompanies E&Y's Report of Independent Accountants, dated January 17, 2003.

Ordering

In order to get maximum coverage of Ordering PMs, E&Y selected random samples by PM transaction type (i.e., Firm Order Confirmation (“FOC”) transactions, Completed Order transactions, etc). E&Y selected random samples from the following ordering transaction types and systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the Ordering PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- FOC transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from Mechanized Order Receipt Application (“MOR”) and Local Access Service Request System (“LASR”) combined, 40 wholesale transactions from EXACT and an additional 25 faxed transactions from MOR in order to ensure adequate coverage of the submeasures.
- Completed order transactions – 265 wholesale transactions (Local Service Requests – LSRs) from MOR; the five additional transactions were randomly selected from certain submeasures in order to ensure adequate coverage of the submeasures.
- Completed order transactions – 260 wholesale transactions (LSRs) from LASR.
- PM 12 only – 538 service orders related to the LSRs tested from the completed order sample from MOR and LASR.
- Reject transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from MOR and LASR combined.
- Jeopardy transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from MOR and LASR combined.
- Jeopardy transactions – 260 retail transactions from Work Force/Administration/Dispatch Out (“WFA/DO”).
- PMs 13 only - Flow through transactions – 540 retail transactions from Ameritech Service Order Negotiation (“ASON”).
- PMs 13 and 13.1 only - Flow through transactions – 265 wholesale transactions from MOR.
- PMs 13 and 13.1 only - Flow through transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from LASR.
- PMs 91 and 93 only - Local Number Portability (“LNP”) transactions – From our randomly selected FOC sample from MOR, 235 transactions plus an additional 152 judgmentally selected LNP transactions to ensure adequate coverage.
- PM 95 only - LNP transactions – From our randomly selected Reject sample from MOR, 200 transactions plus an additional 50 judgmentally selected LNP transactions to ensure adequate coverage.
- PM MI 12 only - Service order sales transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from the SOSALES file. The SOSALES file within the ASON ordering system tracks 3E errors.
- PM MI 12 only - Service order sales transactions – 260 retail transactions from the SOSALES file.

- PM MI 13 only - Line Loss transactions – 260 wholesale transactions from MOR and LASR combined.

Note: 3,102 unique Ordering transactions were tested.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
5	325	222	99	4	1%	16
5.2	260	9	251	0	0%	4
6	325	222	99	4	1%	15
7	525	403	94	28	5%	3
7.1	525	418	99	8	2%	4
8	525	403	94	28	5%	3
9	260	234	24	2	1%	1
10	260	230	28	2	1%	1
10.1	260	187	71	2	1%	1
10.2	260	43	217	0	0%	1
10.3	260	2	258	0	0%	1
10.4	520	283	231	6	1%	22
11	260	230	28	2	1%	1
11.1	260	43	217	0	0%	1
11.2	260	2	258	0	0%	1
12	538	509	29	0	0%	1
13	1,065	865	192	8	1%	6
13.1	525	400	117	8	2%	5
91	387	23	359	5	1%	2
93	387	12	358	17	4%	1
95	250	36	205	9	4%	2
MI 2	520	249	265	6	1%	6
MI 9	260	182	78	0	0%	3
MI 12	520	460	0	60	12%	2
MI 13	260	172	84	4	2%	4
CLEC WI 1	Note 2					
Total	9,797			203	2%	

Note 2: Transaction testing was not performed for this PM due to issues identified in the other testing procedures that indicated this PM was not calculated correctly. Alternative procedures were employed to allow for exception reporting.

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report:

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
5, 6	Certain ULT orders contained an inaccurate stop time. The stop time captured by one reporting system was from the incorrect value captured from the header of a batch-processing file. (Compliance Report, Section IV, Issue 3)	2
5, 6	One ULT transaction was processed into EXACT with an incorrect start time. The start time on this transaction was after the confirmation time for the specific transaction. (Compliance Report, Section IV, Issue 3)	1
5, 6	One ULT transaction contained an inaccurate start time. EXACT was improperly overlaying certain FOC data within DSS, resulting in one order being reported with a longer FOC duration than actually occurred. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 1)	1
	Subtotal 5, 6	4
7, 8	The Company excluded the LNP portion of certain service order confirmations from reported results. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 9)	3
7, 8	Certain orders that did not contain service order completion dates or contained start dates with a null value were reported as meeting the one-hour completion timeline when no data was available to make that determination. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 8)	7
7, 8	Certain orders contained the wrong start time (i.e., if multiple service orders existed on a single LSR, the Company was utilizing the time the first order completed instead of the time the last order completed to determine the start time for the calculation). (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 7)	10
7, 7.1, 8	The Company incorrectly excluded certain valid LASR SOC transactions from results because of an invalid ACNA/Company code value. (Compliance Report, Section V, Issue 1)	8
	Subtotal 7, 8	28
9, 10, 10.1, and 11	Certain valid reject notices were incorrectly excluded from results because of an invalid ACNA/Company code value. (Compliance Report, Section V, Issue 1)	2
10.4	The Company excluded certain wholesale jeopardy transactions processed through LASR from results due to an error in extracting detailed information. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 14)	6

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
13, 13.1	The Company incorrectly excluded certain valid LASR order completion transactions from results because of an invalid ACNA/Company code value. (Compliance Report, Section V, Issue 1)	8
91	The Company improperly included certain LNP transactions in reported results during the Evaluation Period. These transactions were not scheduled within industry guidelines and should have been excluded. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 22)	5
93	The Company excluded certain LNP transactions from reported results in error. LNP with loop orders in which the loop portion of the order was rejected and then later corrected were improperly excluded from reported results. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issues 2 and 24)	17
95	The Company incorrectly excluded certain valid manual LNP rejections transactions from results because they were projects. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 25)	9
MI 2	The Company excluded wholesale LASR transactions in which the scheduled date was erroneously stated as null. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 15)	6
MI 12	The Company excluded wholesale orders from reported results when a field identifying the CLEC was blank. (Compliance Report, Section V, Issue 4)	58
MI 12	The Company excluded retail transactions from reported results where the field cycle date was null. This issue was isolated to the month of May 2002. (Compliance Report, Section IV, Issue 5)	2
	Subtotal MI 12	60
MI 13	Line loss notifications are not being reported when the winning CLEC originates the order through one ordering system, and the Company sends the loss notification to the losing CLEC through a different ordering system. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 28)	4

Provisioning

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems for the Provisioning PMs to test the accuracy and completeness of the Provisioning PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Facilities Modifications (“FMOD”) Database – 260 wholesale transactions

Revised as of
February 19, 2003

- LASR – 273 wholesale transactions. E&Y randomly selected 260 Local Service Requests (“LSRs”) from LASR of which this sample of LSRs had a total of 273 service orders that were tested.
- MOR – 268 wholesale transactions. E&Y randomly selected 260 completed orders from MOR; the eight additional transactions were judgmentally selected in order to ensure adequate coverage of submeasures.
- ASON – 260 retail business and 260 retail residential. An additional 20 retail business specials transactions were judgmentally selected to ensure adequate coverage.
- EXACT – 40 wholesale transactions
- TIRKS – 40 retail transactions

Note: 1,421 unique Provisioning transactions were tested.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Error Rate	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
27	1081	304	777	0	0%	10
28	1081	462	619	0	0%	10
29	1081	509	572	0	0%	8
30	1081	54	1027	0	0%	12
31	1081	1	1080	0	0%	1
32	1081	5	1076	0	0%	4
33	1081	509	572	0	0%	8
35	1081	509	572	0	0%	8
43	1081	19	1062	0	0%	3
44	1081	15	1066	0	0%	3
45	1081	20	1061	0	0%	3
46	1081	20	1061	0	0%	3
47	1081	23	1058	0	0%	9
48	1081	1	1080	0	0%	1
49	1081	2	1079	0	0%	2
50	1081	23	1058	0	0%	3
55	1081	25	1056	2	0%	4
55.1	1081	39	1042	0	0%	3
55.2	541	4	537	0	0%	1
55.3	541	39	502	0	0%	1
56	1081	59	1022	2	0%	6
56.1	541	12	529	0	0%	2
58	1081	115	966	2	0%	8
59	1081	109	972	2	0%	8
60	1081	132	949	2	0%	21

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
61	1081	2	1079	2	0%	3
62	1081	7	1074	2	0%	4
63	1081	132	949	2	0%	7
73	40	13	27	0	0%	2
74	80	1	56	23	29%	1
75	80	44	11	25	31%	3
78	80	9	62	9	11%	2
92	541	23	518	0	0%	1
96	541	10	531	0	0%	2
97	541	24	517	0	0%	2
98	1081	137	944	0	0%	1
99	1081	0	1078	3	0%	1
100	541	23	518	0	0%	1
101	541	24	517	0	0%	1
WI 1	1081	178	901	2	0%	1
WI 9	841	201	631	9	1%	5
CLEC WI 11	841	70	762	9	1%	6
Total	36,558			96	0%	

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report:

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, and WI 1	2 UNE products classified as “unknown products” were not included in the wholesale results. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 32)	2
CLEC WI 11, and WI 9	9 UNE products classified as “unknown products” that were processed through FMOD were not included in the wholesale results. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 32)	9

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
74, 75 and 78	23 transactions in PM 74, 25 transactions in PM 75 and 8 transactions in PM 78. The Company excluded certain transactions with a missed appointment code associated with a project from reported results. In May 2002, the Company excluded all projects from the reported results. The Business Rules do not allow projects to be excluded from results. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 48)	25
78	1 May 2002 transaction contained an error associated with a source system in which the application date was not populated. This error impacted Michigan results only.	1
99	CLEC-caused misses were not excluded from the wholesale results. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 40)	3

Maintenance

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the Maintenance PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Work Force/Administration (“WFA”) – 260 wholesale transactions
- WFA – 260 retail transactions
- Loop Maintenance Operations System (“LMOS”) – 260 wholesale transactions
- LMOS – 260 retail transactions
- PM 76 only – 520 transactions from WFA (randomly selected 260 wholesale and 260 retail selected above) and an additional 80 transactions judgmentally selected from WFA to ensure adequate coverage.

Note: 1,120 unique Maintenance transactions were tested.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
37	520	220	300	0	0%	4
37.1	520	249	271	0	0%	4
38	520	219	301	0	0%	8
39	520	218	302	0	0%	16
40	520	223	297	0	0%	4

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Error Rate	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
41	520	218	302	0	0%	4
42	520	218	302	0	0%	4
52	520	185	335	0	0%	6
53	520	179	341	0	0%	6
54	520	180	340	0	0%	6
54.1	520	164	356	0	0%	5
65	520	295	225	0	0%	9
65.1	520	230	290	0	0%	8
66	520	78	442	0	0%	2
67	520	154	366	0	0%	10
68	520	76	444	0	0%	1
69	520	176	344	0	0%	6
76	600	80	520	0	0%	4
MI 14	260	44	216	0	0%	3
CLEC WI 5	Note 3					
WI 2	520	167	153	0	0%	1
Total	10,220			0	0%	

Note 3: Transaction testing was not performed for this PM due to issues identified in the other testing procedures that indicated this PM was not reported in accordance with the Business Rules. Alternative procedures were employed to allow for exception reporting.

Interconnection Trunks

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the Interconnection Trunk PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Weekly traffic reports – 40 wholesale transactions. Retail results for PM 70 were recalculated from source trunking reports.
- CLEC 271 PM 70-02 (20-day study period monthly report) – 40 wholesale transactions
- Common Transport Monthly Report – 40 wholesale transactions

Note: 120 unique Interconnection Trunk transactions were tested.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
70	40	2	38	0	0%	1
70.1	40	38	2	0	0%	1
70.2	40	40	0	0	0%	1
71	40	40	0	0	0%	1
77	Note 4					
Total	160			0	0%	

Note 4: No data was reported for this measure for the Evaluation Period.

Directory Assistance and Operator Services

For this group of PMs, E&Y tested 100% of the population.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
79	100% Tested			0	0%	7
80	100% Tested			0	0%	1
81	100% Tested			0	0%	7
82	100% Tested			0	0%	1
83	100% Tested			0	0%	2
Total	NA			0	0%	

9-1-1

E&Y selected random samples from the following sources to test the accuracy and completeness of the 9-1-1 PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Intrado (third-party vendor) 911 unlock report – 260 wholesale transactions

Note: 260 unique 9-1-1 transactions were tested.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Error Rate	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
102	100% Tested			0	0%	1
103 ⁴	0			0	0%	0
104	100% Tested			0	0%	1
104.1	260 (Note 5)	130	0	130	50% ⁵	1
Total	260			130	50%	

Note 5: March, April, and May 2002 data were originally reported incorrectly. Ameritech restated May data going forward to correct the reported issue. Therefore, E&Y performed transaction testing for the month of May only.

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report:

PM Impacted	Exception	Number of Exceptions
104.1	The restated data in May 2002 contained errors, which resulted in data being improperly excluded from results. The errors related to matching of orders in LASR and MOR to the data received from Intrado. (Compliance Report, Section V, Issue 13)	130

Poles, Conduit, and Right of Way

E&Y selected a random sample of 40 wholesale transactions from the structure database and judgmentally selected an additional 17 transactions.

Note: 57 unique Poles, Conduit, and Right-of-Way transactions were tested.

⁴ There were no CLEC requests for compare files during the Evaluation Period and thus there were no transactions to test.

⁵ The total transactions for the month of May for PM 104.1 was 30,000. Due to E&Y only testing the month of May (Note 5), E&Y randomly selected 130 included transactions from the total included transactions of 24,710. E&Y randomly selected 130 excluded transactions from the total of excluded transactions of 5,290. It was determined that all of the transactions should have been included, resulting in a 17% error rate for the entire population for PM 104.1.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
105	57	31	14	12	21%	1
106	57	31	14	12	21%	1
MI 5	57	31	14	12	21%	2
Total	171			36	21%	

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report:

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
105, 106, MI 5	Testing of supporting documentation for the transactions that comprise these PMs revealed that start and stop times were not accurately calculated and that supporting documentation for transactions was not appropriately maintained. Additionally, certain transactions were reported in the wrong month. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 45, and Section IV, Issue 7)	12

Directory Assistance Database

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the Directory Assistance Database PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Master Data Sheet⁶ – 260 wholesale transactions. An additional 40 transactions were judgmentally selected in order to ensure adequate coverage of PM 112.

Note: 300 unique Directory Assistance Database transactions were tested.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
110	260 (Note 7)	230	0	30	12%	2
111	260 (Note 7)	230	0	30	12%	2

⁶ The Master Data Sheet is a detail of all faxed orders received.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
112	300	230	40	30	10%	1
113	Note 6			0	0%	1
Total	820			90	11%	

Note 6: Selected 5 days of transactions for the month of May (approximately 15,000 transactions), and validated that the proper records were being included and excluded according to the Business Rules.

Note 7: For the electronic submeasures for PMs 110 and 111, we performed a code review of the application programs utilized to extract data and apply the Business Rules from the source system files (i.e., A10 files which compile total CLEC update requests). The resulting data file that was sent to the PM reporting group for inclusion in results was then obtained and utilized to recalculate the numerator, denominator, and result at a CLEC aggregate level. For the manual submeasures for PMs 110 and 111 we randomly selected 260 wholesale transactions.

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report:

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
110, 111, 112	Testing of supporting documentation for 18 transactions that comprise these PMs revealed that critical dates and times used to calculate these PMs did not agree to supporting documentation, and for 12 transactions supporting documentation was not appropriately maintained. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 46)	30

Bona Fide Request Process (“BFR”)

E&Y tested 100% of the transaction population for the BFR PMs.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
120	100% Tested			0	0%	1
121	Note 8					0
Total	NA			0	0%	

Note 8: No data was reported for this performance measure for the Evaluation Period.

Local Service Center (“LSC”)/Local Operations Center (“LOC”) Automatic Call Distributor (“ACD”)

For this group of PMs, E&Y tested 100% of the population. E&Y obtained populations from Local Service Center ACD reports, Local Operations Center ACD reports, Retail Consumer Center ACD reports, Retail Business Center ACD reports, and the Customer Service Bureau ACD reports. For the ACD transactions listed below, the population was considered to be the monthly summary report of ACD calls from each of the sources noted above. If the monthly report contained an error that impacted reported results by five percent or more, the error was reported as an exception in the table below.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Error Rate	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
21.1	100% Tested			0	0%	3
22	100% Tested			1	NA	3
24.1	100% Tested			0	0%	3
25	100% Tested			1	NA	2
Total	NA			2	NA	

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report:

PM Impacted	Exception	Number of Exceptions
22	March 2002 results were restated in June 2002 to include all required service centers in the retail results. Although all 3 submeasures were impacted, only 1 error occurred as the same retail result is utilized for all 3 parity comparisons. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 47)	1
25	Due to a manual calculation error, April 2002 retail data was improperly reported. (Compliance Report, Section IV, Issue 6)	1

NXX

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the NXX PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Code Activation Notification database – 50 wholesale transactions. 40 wholesale transactions were randomly selected with an additional 10 wholesale transactions that were judgmentally sampled to obtain necessary testing coverage for PM 117.
- Work Force/Administration/Dispatch In (“WFA/DI”) NXX trouble tickets – 100% of population tested.

Note: 50 unique NXX transactions were tested.

						Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
117	50	7	42	1	2%	1
118	Note 9					
119	100% Tested			0	0%	1
Total	50			1	2%	

Note 9: No data was reported for this performance measure for the Evaluation Period. E&Y tested 50 transactions, all properly excluded.

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report:

PM Impacted	Exception	Number of Exceptions
117	The Company considers an NXX code request to be on time as long as it completes testing by the end of the week containing the due date, instead of by the actual due date as required by the Business Rules. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 49)	1

Coordinated Hot-Cuts (“CHC”)/Frame Due Time (“FDT”)

E&Y selected random samples from the following systems to test the accuracy and completeness of the CHC/FDT PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- LOC Scheduler – 260 wholesale transactions

Note: 260 unique CHC/FDT transactions were tested.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>		<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
114 ⁷	260	242	18	0	0%	2
114.1	260	242	18	0	0%	3
115 ⁵	260	242	18	0	0%	8
115.1	260 (Note 10)	242	18	0	0%	2
115.2	100% Tested			0	0%	2
MI 3	260	162	98	0	0%	1
Total	1,300			0	0%	

Note 10: The numerator for PM 115.1 is the same data population 100% tested in PM 115.2.

OSS Interface

E&Y selected random samples from the following sources to test the accuracy and completeness of the OSS Interface PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- For PM 4 only – 100% of vantage trouble tickets that resulted in an interface outage were tested.
- For PM MI 11 only - Broadcast fax log – 40 notifications

Note: 40 unique OSS Interface transactions were tested.

⁷ As determined in other testing procedures, PMs 114 and 115 were not correctly reported for the Evaluation Period. See Attachment A to our Report of Independent Accountants on the Company’s compliance with the Business Rules and the Report of Management for the exceptions noted for PMs 114 and 115. The transaction testing performed for PMs 114 and 115 was performed in accordance with the Company’s procedures, which were not in compliance with the Business Rules.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
4	100% Tested			2	NA	18
MI 11	40	18	3	19	48%	1
Total	40			21	NA	

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report.

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
4	Two exceptions related to manual errors were noted in the reporting of interface outage time. However, since 100% of the population was tested, it was determined that the errors did not have a material impact on reported results. As such, these exceptions are not included in our report on the Company’s compliance with the Business Rules.	2
MI 11	Manual errors were noted in the recording of start and end times associated with this PM. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 51)	19

Change Management

For this PM, E&Y tested 100% of the population.

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
MI 15	100% Tested			2	NA	2
Total	NA			2	NA	

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report.

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
MI 15	The Company did not appropriately capture the denominator for this PM during the Evaluation Period. Instead of using all changes implemented during the month as the denominator as stated in the Business Rules, the Company captures the number of notification letters sent during the month as the denominator to calculate the number of notifications issued on time. (Compliance Report, Section I, Issue 52)	2

Billing

Due to the nature of the Billing PMs, E&Y performed transaction testing as follows:

- PM 14 - Monthly bill sample listing – Randomly chose 40 wholesale bills and 40 retail bills and compared USOC rates to the billing tables and reviewed proper handling of the bill audit results according to the Business Rules.
- PM 15 - Monthly sampling log – Randomly selected 6 audited EDI wholesale bills and audited the bills in accordance with the Business Rules and proper handling of the bill audit results according to the Business Rules.
- PM 16 - Monthly Resale Unbundled Report/Monthly Transmittal Report – Randomly chose 40 transmittals to verify that each transmittal was appropriately classified as to an Ameritech- or CLEC-caused error and the transmittal was appropriately included or excluded according to the Business Rules.
- PM 18 - RBS Cycle reports – Randomly selected 40 wholesale bills. In addition, randomly selected 50 Illinois retail bills from ACIS and 50 Illinois wholesale bills from CABS.
- PM 19 - Monthly Resale Unbundled Report – Tested that the entire population, for period under review was accurate as to the number of daily usage files sent on time and sent late from the Mainframe to PRS.

Note: 266 unique billing transactions/events were tested.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Error Rate	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
14	80	80	0	0	0%	2
15	6 (Note 12)	6	0	0	0%	1
16	40	40	0	0	0%	1
17	Note 11			0	NA	1
18	140	140	0	0	0%	2
19	100% Tested			0	0%	1
20	Note 11			0	NA	1
Total	266			0	0%	

Note 11: Due to the nature of these PMs, alternative testing procedures including a detail code review were performed for these PMs. See the interpretations in our report regarding the Company’s processes to capture billing information in these PMs.

Note 12: The 6 transactions related to bills transmitted via EDI (Resale). For CABS bills, E&Y reviewed the program code utilized to determine totaling, formatting, content, and syntax errors for propriety. No exceptions were noted.

Collocation

E&Y selected random samples from the following sources to test the accuracy and completeness of the Collocation PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- Collocation Database – 40 wholesale completed projects
- Collocation Database – 40 wholesale project requests

Note: 80 unique Collocation transactions were tested.

PM Number	Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM	Properly Included	Properly Excluded	Exceptions	Error Rate	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
107	40	40	0	0	0%	5
108	40	40	0	0	0%	4
109	40	40	0	0	0%	4
MI 4	40	9	31	0	0%	1
Total	160			0	0%	

FMOD

E&Y selected random samples from the following sources to test the accuracy and completeness of the FMOD PMs during the Evaluation Period:

- FMOD Database – Randomly selected 260 wholesale transactions and judgmentally selected 5 additional transactions to obtain coverage for CLEC WI 9.

Note: 265 unique FMOD transactions were tested.

<u>PM Number</u>	Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	Error Rate	Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included
CLEC WI 6	265	190	70	5	2%	3 ⁸
CLEC WI 7	265	182	70	13	5%	8 ⁹
CLEC WI 8	265	29	233	3	1%	3
CLEC WI 9	265	1	264	0	0%	1
Total	1,060			21	2%	

⁸ For CLEC WI 6, 60 transactions were noted that the initial FOC time in MORTEL did not agree to the initial FOC recorded in the FMOD database. However, the use of an incorrect time for these instances did not change whether the interval was met. Additionally, the difference in times was 1-2 minutes and would not impact the attainment of the 24-hour benchmark, and thus this issue is considered immaterial and is not included in our report on the Company’s compliance with the Business Rules.

⁹ For CLEC WI 7, 1 transaction was noted that the Form D sent time did not agree to the Form D sent time in the FMOD database. However, the use of an incorrect time for these instances did not change whether the interval was met. Additionally, the difference in time was less than 2 minutes and would not impact the attainment of the 24-hour benchmark, and thus this issue is considered immaterial and is not included our report on the Company’s compliance with the Business Rules.

Exceptions: Each exception is documented below with a reference to where it is disclosed in the Compliance Report:

<u>PM Impacted</u>	<u>Exception</u>	<u>Number of Exceptions</u>
CLEC WI 6, 7, 8	5 transactions in CLEC WI 6, 13 transactions in CLEC WI 7 and 3 transactions in CLEC WI 8 – Due to errors in data collection by the reporting systems, the Company improperly excluded certain transactions from reported results. (Compliance Report, Section II, Issue 50)	21

Additional Measures

<u>PM Number</u>	<u>Total Number of Transactions Tested Per PM</u>	<u>Properly Included</u>	<u>Properly Excluded</u>	<u>Exceptions</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>	<u>Number of Submeasures in Which Sampled Transactions Were Properly Included</u>
CLEC WI 4	Note 13				NA	

Note 13: No data was reported for this PM for the Evaluation Period.